UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,640	03/01/2004	Michael D. West	60141.0022USU2	9766
28120 ROPES & GRA	7590 03/06/200 XY LLP	EXAMINER		
PATENT DOC		BERTOGLIO, VALARIE E		
BOSTON, MA	ATIONAL PLACE 02110-2624		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1632	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/790,640	WEST ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Valarie Bertoglio	1632		

	Valarie Bertoglio	1632	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1.2)		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	The rejection of the claims as being	g anticipated by Robl	<u>is withdrawn</u> .
non-allowable claim(s). 7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ↓ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov	· —	l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	ided below of appended.		
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-8,10-39,69-78,80-92 and 94-105</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>40-67</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Valarie Bertoglio/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1632	
	,		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claim 7 raise new issues for consideration under 35 USC 102/103 as well as 112 1st paragraph. The claim is also indefinite as it cannot be determined if the genetic alteration occurs as part of the method of claim 1 or if the primary cell is transfected prior to its isolation. Claim 13 requires new consideration as it is not clear what constitutes "suitable". The proposed amendment to claim 25 raises issues under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, specifically, for example, in use of the term "using" in line 4. Additionally, the proposed claim 25 amendments raise issues under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph. Claim 106 also raises new issues for consideration under 35 USC 1st and 2nd paragraph.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claim amendments have not been entered. To the extent that Applicant's arguments rely on the proposed claim amendments, the rejections are maintained. Claims remain provisionally rejected under obviousness type double patenting. With respect to US 6,808,704, Applicant argues that the claims of '704 do not require cells be sensecent or near senescence. In response, this provisional rejection is not a statutory rejection, but is an obviousness type rejection. Furthermore, additional steps recited in the patent fail to render non-obvious the claimed method steps. The provisional obviousness type double patenting rejection over 11/079930 is maintained as Applicant states that the filing of a TD will be considered pending allowance of the insttant claims.